

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

HARRY J. PRIEN,
Plaintiff,

v.

GARY LUCAS, *et al.*,
Defendants.

Case No. C07-5647 RJB/KLS

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

Before the Court is Plaintiff's third motion for counsel (Dkt. # 20), which the Court considers a motion for reconsideration of its Order denying Plaintiff's previous motions for counsel. (Dkt. # 18). Having carefully reviewed Plaintiff's most recent motion, the Court finds that it should be denied.

DISCUSSION

Motions for reconsideration are disfavored and will ordinarily be denied in the "absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to the court's attention earlier with reasonable diligence." Local Rule CR 7(h)(1).

In his third motion for counsel, Plaintiff argues again that he is not trained in the law, that he

1 has limited access to a law library, and that jail officials are withholding medical records. These are
2 not new facts or legal arguments. The Court addressed Plaintiff's argument and found that these
3 grounds were insufficient to warrant appointment of counsel. (Dkt. # 18). The Court noted that
4 Plaintiff has demonstrated an adequate ability to articulate his claims *pro se*, has not demonstrated
5 that the issues involved in his case are complex or that he has had any difficulties in expressing
6 them. *Id.* Further, Plaintiff has not demonstrated that there is a likelihood of success on the merits
7 of his claims. *Id.*

8 There is nothing in Plaintiff's third motion to change the Court's analysis. Plaintiff has
9 identified no error in this Court's Order, nor presented any new facts or legal authority that suggest
10 reconsideration is appropriate.

11 Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. # 20) is **DENIED**.

12 DATED this 12th day of March, 2008.

13
14
15 

16 Karen L. Strombom
17 United States Magistrate Judge
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26